DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 074 CG 003 102

By- Mills, David H.

The Use of Fantasy and Imagery in the Training of Counselors: The Cognitive Trap in Graduate Education.

American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Apr 68

Note- 8p.; Speech presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Detroit, Michigan, April 7-11, 1968.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50

Descriptors- Counseling Effectiveness, *Counselor Training, Group Counseling, *Interpersonal Relationship, *Sensitivity Training

I am concerned over the relative lack of emphasis in counseling training programs on the non-cognitive, non-quantifiable aspects of human interaction. Despite the academic press for grades and quantifiable indices, we must push towards integrating some of these spooky areas into our programs. Not to do so will attenuate our effectiveness, though we may gain in sterile academic respectability. I have suggested three steps as a starting point in this integration. These steps are supervision for divergent responses, modeling techniques, and sensitivity training. (AUTHOR)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Presented at the American Personnel & Guidance Association Meetings, Detroit, April 9, 1968.

ED0 24074

THE USE OF FANTASY AND IMAGRY IN THE TRAINING OF COUNSELORS: THE COGNITIVE TRAP IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

David H. Mills, Ph.D.
Iowa State University

I think we have a serious problem which is relatively unique to the areas of counseling and guidance, counseling psychology and clinical psychology. This problem stems from having our feet planted both in the cognitive and the affective realms. That is, our disciplines are part of a graduate school or more generally, an educational milieu which promotes, rewards, and turns out products which have skill and competence in dealing with facts, numbers, the bag of research methodology, the realm of cognition. And in part, that is how it should be. If there are no objective skills, if there are no "facts," if there is no basic area of knowledge, then as counselor educators, we might just as well fold up our tape recorders or our Strong Vocational Interest Inventories and go home. Happily, these cognitive areas do exist. These exist however too well and since it is this area where there may be objective indices of competence it is my feeling that we spent too much time in training for working with cognition to the detriment of our finished product. Kenneth Keniston in his 1967 book "The Uncommitted" states the "The successful product of (modern) education is an individual who has the capacity to concentrate for long periods on assigned tasks, to remain cool, dispassionate, accurate and objective in work, to undertake and carry through unaided, complicated and long-range projects...". This is good, especially good if one is in the hard sciences or even the hard end of behavioral sciences. Counselors obviously need these attributes, but it is my contention that they need much more. Coolness, dispassion, objectivity may in truth interfere with their interactions

CG 003 102

with their clients. These clients, despite neat categorizations in text-books and journal articles, are still human and as such are irrational on occasion, still express non-quantifiable affective phenomena, and have day dreams and fantasies which transcend the cognitive rules of every-day life. While we can treat them as objects, this does not turn them into those objects. They still are much more and it is these extra qualities which we miss as products of the system in which we teach or learn. But, our dilemma as counselors in training or as counselor trainers have is how to integrate training for sensitivity to non-objective phenomena within a system which requires objectivity. Paraphrasing several other persons, I feel strongly that central among the neglected potentials of counseling are the capacities termed "regression in the service of the ego"--that is the ability of the ego to, as it were, "shut itself off" and thereby remain open to the childish, the sexual, the creative, and the dreamlike." If our clients live partially in an unobjective world where things can be symbolic or affective, then it seems to me that to deal with them as individuals, as the individuals they phenomenologically are, then we have to be comfortable in these realms also. Not to be so is to tell the client implicitly that we can accept only part of him, that part which can be tested or rationally worked into a diagnostic or prognostic formulation. This may be a fine approach to gain respectability among our "scientific" con-freres, educational research people, experimental psychologists, and those paragons of virtue, the chemists and physicists, but it sure as hell doesn't help our clients. Respectability when linked with attenuated usefulness is a type of professional suicide, the after-life for which is academic sterility and triviality. And yet, I am afraid that this is the direction in which we are going. Hence my current concern and these intellectual ramblings.

Now, what can we do about it. We grope, we flounder, we divest ourselves of some of our academic respectability; we try to prepare our students better than we ourselves were prepared. The child is in truth the father of the man. We badly need to loosen ourselves and our students up so that we all can deal with the intricacies of our clients and not just their rational or quantitative aspects.

I am going to suggest a three point program of training which can be effected at the practicum or interne level. This approach is not a panacea for the ills which I have described but it seems to me to be a beginning step.

First, and probably the most important, is a philosophy of supervision which is related to student growth in an atmosphere of controlled freedom and not associated with concern over "rightness" or "wrongness" of specific responses. This philosophy can be labelled as training for divergent response. In such supervision, the student interaction with his client is looked at as a manifestation of a growth process for both participants (and, if we were to be completely truthful, oftentimes for the supervisor). The supervisor does not bear down heavily upon instrumental responses accepting some as being appropriate and others as being inappropriate. Rather he focuses with his supervisee more upon the "why's" of what is going on, what is the over-all process at the time. Random error by the supervisee is to be expected and when it occurs can either be overlooked or can be looked at in a relatively non-judgmental way. For example, the supervisor may direct the supervision towards why the client pulled this response from the counselor and alternative responses might be suggested. These alternative responses are given not because the student erred but more to establish a frame of reference which allows several things. First, it allows or aids the student to realize that in most, if not all, cases there is no one best way of doing things, and it helps him to articulate differential functions

of the various responses. If there has to be strong reinforcement from the supervisor it should be attached to this articulation of various ways of dealing with the same situation and not to the student's understandable drive to find the one best way. As such, the student is given the freedom to relax, to participate more freely in counseling and to not feel bound to one Markovian chain of counseling process. His response potential to a given situation is thus enlarged. Secondly, such a procedure will give the student the feeling (which I feel is appropriate) that there is almost never a single crucial error in counseling. Once this monkey is off his back and he realizes that, typically, similar situations will occur again and again in his contact with a given client he will have less concern about having missed what may have seemed like a crucial point or interaction and will have some faith that not only will this point come around again but also that when it does he will be equipped differently to handle it.

Now, I have been talking about the counseling equivalent of what random error is to the psychometrician. This includes to me counselor interactions which might not have been as facilitating as they could have been but which occurred because of the client's resistance or the counselor's anxiety, or simply his lack of experience. There are kinds of systematic error which seem to be different qualitatively. These occur for two reasons. First, and maybe the most typical, is the systematic error introduced by the client's style of defenses, where the client consistently pushes the counselor into a non-facilitating or distorted role, I think this situation can be handled much as I have suggested the random errors can be. The type of systematic distortion, however, which is introduced by the counselor himself is a very different case. If the distortion seems to be impeding the counselor's effectiveness then

it would appear to be appropriate for the supervisor to suggest that the supervisee go into counseling himself. It clearly seems to be a supervisor's responsibility to make this suggestion (although I am impressed with the number of supervisors who do not do so because of embarrassment or some vague stigma which they attach to personal training therapies--obviously, this is a double standard; what is good for the goose is not good for the gander. It typically connotes a condescending attitude towards their own clients and students). Minor, but systematic, distortions seem to be able to be handled within the supervision but only if the needs of the client are not forgotten.

The second major point I would like to make is a common sense one which was codified by Bandura, et al., at Stanford. Essentially, this has to do with modeling, in this case the counselor (i.e., the supervisee) modeling after his supervisor. As supervisors we should feel free to allow our own fantasies and imagry to enter into the supervisory process. Most people can elicit imagry and articulate their fantasies about clients if they have a set do do so. What I do personally, is to allow myself to associate rather freely to my supervisee's clients using as stimulus material the actual productions of the client. Depending upon the situation I use tape recordings, video-tapes or actual observation. I think that this does for the student two different things. One is that it allows him the freedom to attend to non-cognitive stimuli, however wild they may be, and the second is that it again gives the student the set that the usual criteria for correctness of accuracy may not be too appropriate here. A typical kind of production in this area would be a situation whereby a client came across to me (through tape-recording of his interview with a supervisee of mine) as a frightened, weak little child huddled in the corner, this despite a physical and superficially psychological

image of being a coping, competent individual. If he were my own client I would have brought this image into the open and asked the client why he thought I had picked up that kind of imagry from him (not, "is that an accurate picture of you?" or some other quasi-objective scanning of the situation--"just why do I get this impression from you when you look and act so different.") In the case in question, the supervisee was so mystified as I was as to the referents for the impression. However, and I realize that this may be a folie deux, he utilized a similar impression later with the client only to find out that the client, who had been seen for several months because of obsessive smoking, was in truth extremely frightened of homosexuality and up to that point had not been able to bring these concerns out in the open. An important point here, however, is that I might have been wrong (and I do not know what wrong means exactly) in this imagry,but, feeling that in the Rogerian sense I am a relatively congruent person, I am comfortable in saying that I do not get this type of image of a person very often and so I can assume that it is coming from some non-cognitive stimuli which the client is giving me. At the very least it initiates material for the counseling. I don't respond to all of my images nor do I expect my supervisee to. If a very attractive woman comes in and seems to be functioning at a reasonable adult level, I may get sexual images which come from me primarily and probably are not germaine to the task at hand. I might, however, respond if a very attractive female came in and there was no sexual imagry kicked up in me.

The third major point I have is one about which I have some ambivalence. The current vogue especially among the Rogerian or relationship oriented counselors and therapists is sensitivity training or "T-Group" work. Throwing a bunch of people together and attempting to divest them of their psychological masks in a guise of generating increased sensitivity to others and to their

own needs and feelings may be an admirable pursuit. I have been dismayed, however, by several things with regard to the movement. One is very cultish nature of the persons with an NTL orientation, the feeling which I have gotten from some of them (Carl Rogers not excluded) that they have the future of the human race in their hands. I tend to distrust anything touted so absolutely (especially when some of the touting is done by persons who also to their professional colleagues seem to be impressed with how much they get paid for this service). Several other things bother me about T-Groups also. Scientifically, we have no evidence that the sensitivity can be developed in the group. While this bothers me, this is not a major concern in the light of the shabbiness of our measuring tools and of the criteria for change. T-Groups may really be doing a tremendous job and may have far-outstripped the instrumental measures for sensitivity, empathy, and psychological change. But, I think we must not forget that we still do not know if such groups are effective. I am sure that a T-Group experience facilitates communication and sensitivity within that particular group. I have seen this and I have experienced it. However, it is currently a matter of faith that this increase in sensitivity will generalize outside the particular T-Group in which one has participated. I have faith that it does but, frankly, I wish that I had more than faith to back me up. I was recently drafted into leading a T-Group both against some of my own resistances and my protest that my credentials did not include the blessing from Bethel. This was a group of overtly well-adjusted individuals in my home community who had read about T-Groups and felt some need to form one. Central Iowa is a rather barren place in which to find group leaders and so I agreed to lead the group jointly with a colleague (and without pay) because I felt our leadership would be better than their forming a leaderless group--sometimes bad breath is better than no breath at all. Both Nancy Cherry,

the other co-leader, and I entered into the experience with some anxiety and concern. The group negotiated and decided upon ten weekly meetings of three hours each. We currently have had 8 of those meetings and it has been an exhilerating experience. I have never seen a group, any kind of therapy or counseling group, begin so rapidly and intensely. The first three hour session seemed like about 45 minutes with Nancy and I looking at each other in amazement. People are willing to work hard at increasing their genuineness and at understanding (and changing) their impact upon others. The need seems definitely to be there and the technique seems (and I say "seems") appropriate. I think that such an experience would be invaluable to persons training for counseling (or engaged in it). We must know the impact we have on those very important others, our clients; we must know the image we present in order better to know what is distortion and what is not. We must be in tune with our own motivations and dynamics. It seems to me, though I am still not a true believer, that sensitivity training can be used for these ends.

In summary, I am concerned over the relative lack of emphasis in counseling training programs on the non-cognitive, non-quantifiable aspects of human interaction. Despite the academic press for grades and quantifiable indices, we must push towards integrating some of these spooky areas into our programs. Not to do so will attenuate our effectiveness though we may gain insterile academic respectability. I have suggested 3 steps as a starting point in this integration. These steps are supervision for divergent responses, modeling techniques, and sensitivity training.